

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19, 22, 24, 25, 28 and 31 have been amended. Claim 34 is new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 18 and 24 are objected because of informalities. The claims have been amended to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 9-10, 14, 22-24 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for "a communication station for operating as a terminal station", does not reasonably provide enablement for "a communication station for operating as a base station." Claims 13, 19-21 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for "a communication station for operating as a base station", does not reasonably provide enablement for "a communication station for operating as a terminal station." Claims 14, 22-24 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanerva, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,052,385; hereinafter Kanerva). Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to define that each of the plurality of channels is defined by a different frequency. Kanerva, et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest a plurality of channels where each channel is defined by a different frequency.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 1 and 8, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 2, which depends from Claim 1, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanerva (U.S. Pat. No. 6,052,385; hereinafter Kanerva) in view of Dahlman, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,907,005 B1; hereinafter Dahlman). Claims 3-7 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 3-7 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 has been amended the same as Claim 1. Thus, the above discussion regarding Kanerva applies here also. Dahlman also does not disclose, teach or suggest the plurality of channels each defined by a different frequency. Thus, Applicants believe

Claim 9 and Claim 10, which depends from Claim 9, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bender, et al. (US 2004/0190471 A1) in view of Kanerva (U.S. Pat. No. 6,052,385; hereinafter Kanerva). Claims 11, 13-15, 19, 22, 25, 28 and 31 have each been amended the same as Claim 1. Thus, the above discussion regarding Kanerva applies here also. In addition, Bender, et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest the plurality of channels each defined by a different frequency.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 11, 13-15, 19, 22, 25, 28 and 31 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 12, 16-18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32 and 33, which ultimately depend from one of the previously listed independent claims, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **NEW CLAIM**

Claim 34 is a dependent claim which depends from Claim 1 and it defines that the one communication station includes a buffer that stores the plurality of send packets, and a channel controller that sends as one packet unit each of the plurality of send packets to the another communication station.

Kanerva teaches transmission of data through a plurality of channels in parallel by dividing data (packet) by a divider TAF 31 and combining divided data by a combiner IWF 41, as described in column 7, lines 22-39 and shown in Fig. 5. This is similar to what has


been discussed in the background part (pages 1-2) of the present specification. It fails to teach the above feature of Claim 34.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 7, 2007

By:   
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg